REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed June 21, 2006. Claims 1-29 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

1.   Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 7-22, and 24-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Belfiore* (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,459). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed subject matter must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). In the present case, not every feature of the claimed subject matter is represented in the *Belfiore* reference. Applicant discusses the *Belfiore* reference and Applicant's claims in the following.

a.   Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

> A method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:
>> receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponds to a resource;
>> *soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid;*
>> receiving input of said search terms;
>> *searching a predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms;*
>> *presenting a list of all valid RLs in said predetermined index with addresses that correspond to said search terms;*
>> receiving selection of a RL from said list; and
>> retrieving and displaying content from said selected RL

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid," "searching a predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms," or "presenting a list of all valid RLs in said

6

predetermined index with addresses that correspond to said search terms," as recited and emphasized above in claim 1.

Rather, *Belfiore* discloses at most a system that provides:

a mechanism for a computer system to automatically and intelligently determine what a user intended when the user entered text within an Address box or other user interface element. Often users improperly enter URLs or enter search terms in a user interface element that requires URLs. The present invention identifies many such instances and automatically retrieves information regarding appropriate web sites so that the user can gain access to the desired web site. The present invention does not require added effort from the user and helps increase the resilience of the system to user input errors.

Col. 4, lines 29-40. (Emphasis added). Thus, *Belfiore* fails to disclose the step of "soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid," since *Belfiore* teaches that search terms are automatically processed from the terms initially inputted by a user. After terms are determined to be invalid, the user is not solicited for additional input. Rather, the system automatically processes the terms without user involvement. Therefore, *Belfiore* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 1, such as soliciting input of search terms.

Further, *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms [that were solicited from the user in response to an invalid RL]." For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends. Accordingly, *Belfiore* fails to teach "presenting a list of all valid RLs in said predetermined index with addresses that correspond to said search terms," since *Belfiore* teaches that a list of web sites are presented with content (e.g., text from title of web page, text from body of web page, etc.) that corresponds to the search terms and does not show that a list of addresses that correspond to said search terms are presented.

In the Office Action, it states that "[s]ince the address box [in *Belfiore*] is always available for any subsequent attempts . . . the act of 'soliciting input of search term' is inherent, though implicit to Belfore's system." Page 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, if the address box is always available regardless of the situation, *Belfiore* does not seem to suggest "soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid," as recited in the claim. In addition, if the address box is always available and always had the label "address" next to it as shown in the figures, this seemingly fails to teach or suggest "soliciting input of search

7

terms," as recited in the claim. Rather, it seemingly suggests that input of an address is desired.

The Office Action further states that "it is noted that step 72 of Fig.4 is part of the auto-search. That is, if no valid results turn out after searching for the entered terms, the process would produce an error message. This is not related to the 'searching in response to invalid RL' feature." Page 5. Applicants submit, however, if this is the case, then there does not appear to be any searching in response to an invalid RL being performed in *Belfiore*. For example, in step 92, of Fig. 7, *Belfiore* checks the syntax and format of an entered URL to determine if it is valid. If the format is not valid, then the autosearch process is implemented. In checking the format of the entered URL, the URL is checked to see if it contains a slash ("/") or a period ("."), for example. *See* col. 5, lines 25-36. *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms," as recited in the claim, however.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Belfiore*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-3 and 7

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-3 and 7 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2-3 and 7 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 1. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 2-3 and 7 should be withdrawn.

c. Claim 8

As provided in independent claim 8, Applicant claims:

A method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:
receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponding to an address for a resource;
determining if said RL is valid;
soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid;
receiving input of said RL search string; and
searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL search string.

8

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid," or "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 8.

Rather, *Belfiore* discloses at most a system that provides:

> a mechanism for a computer system to automatically and intelligently determine what a user intended when the user entered text within an Address box or other user interface element. Often users improperly enter URLs or enter search terms in a user interface element that requires URLs. The present invention identifies many such instances and automatically retrieves information regarding appropriate web sites so that the user can gain access to the desired web site. The present invention does not require added effort from the user and helps increase the resilience of the system to user input errors.

Col. 4, lines 29-40. (Emphasis added). Thus, *Belfiore* fails to disclose the step of "soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid," since *Belfiore* teaches that search terms are automatically processed from the terms initially inputted by a user. After terms are determined to be invalid, the user is not solicited for additional input. Rather, the system automatically processes the terms without user involvement. Therefore, *Belfiore* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 8, such as soliciting input of search terms.

Further, *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string [that was provided in response to an invalid RL] to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL search string." For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends.

In the Office Action, it states that "[s]ince the address box [in *Belfiore*] is always available for any subsequent attempts . . . the act of 'soliciting input of search term' is inherent, though implicit to Belfore's system." Page 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, if the address box is always available regardless of the situation, *Belfiore* does not seem to suggest "soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid," as recited in the claim. In addition, if the address box is always available and always had the label "address" next to it as shown in the figures, this seemingly fails to teach or suggest "soliciting input of

search terms," as recited in the claim. Rather, it seemingly suggests that input of an address is desired.

The Office Action further states that "it is noted that step 72 of Fig.4 is part of the auto-search. That is, if no valid results turn out after searching for the entered terms, the process would produce an error message. This is not related to the 'searching in response to invalid RL' feature." Page 5. Applicants submit, however, that if this is the case, there does not appear to be any searching in response to an invalid RL being performed in *Belfiore*, then. For example, in step 92, of Fig. 7, *Belfiore* checks the syntax and format of an entered URL to determine if it is valid. If the format is not valid, then the autosearch process is implemented. In checking the format of the entered URL, the URL is checked to see if it contains a slash ("/") or a period ("."), for example. *See* col. 5, lines 25-36. *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL search string," as recited in the claim, however.

For at least these reasons, claim 8 is not anticipated by *Belfiore*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 9-12

Because independent claim 8 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 9-12 (which depend from independent claim 8) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 9-12 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 8. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 9-12 should be withdrawn.

e. Claim 13

As provided in independent claim 13, Applicant claims:

A method of selecting a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:

receiving input of a RL at a user device, said RL corresponding to a resource;

determining if said RL is valid;

generating a RL search string at the user device if said RL is invalid; and

searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a

10

location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 13.

For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends. Accordingly, *Belfiore* fails to teach "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," since *Belfiore* teaches that a list of web sites are presented with content (*e.g.*, text from title of web page, text from body of web page, *etc.*) that corresponds to the search terms and does not show that a list of addresses or names that correspond to said search terms are presented.

For at least this reason, *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited in the claim. (Emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, claim 13 is not anticipated by *Belfiore*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

f. Claims 14-17

Because independent claim 13 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 14-17 (which depend from independent claim 13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 14-17 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 13. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 14-17 should be withdrawn.

11

g.   **Claim 18**

As provided in independent claim 18, Applicant claims:

A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising:

controller for receiving a RL search string from a user device, wherein said RL search string is generated at the user device based upon an invalid RL that was provided as input to the user device;

memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs; and

said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 18 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 18.

For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends. Accordingly, *Belfiore* fails to teach "said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," since *Belfiore* teaches that a list of web sites are presented with content (*e.g.*, text from title of web page, text from body of web page, *etc.*) that corresponds to the search terms and does not show that a list of addresses or names that correspond to said search terms are presented.

For at least this reason, *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited in the claim. (Emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, claim 18 is not anticipated by *Belfiore*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

12

h.   Claims 19-22

Because independent claim 18 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 19-22 (which depend from independent claim 13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 19-22 contain all the elements and features of independent claim 18.   For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 19-22 should be withdrawn.

i.   Claim 24

As provided in independent claim 24, Applicant claims:

> A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator
> (RL) comprising:
>   controller for receiving a RL from a user device;
>   *memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs*
> *at the user device;*
>   *said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said*
> *RL is determined to be invalid; and*
>   *said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search*
> *term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid*
> *RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs at the user device; said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said RL is determined to be invalid; and said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 24.

For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends. Accordingly, *Belfiore* fails to teach "said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," since *Belfiore* teaches that a list of web sites are presented with content (*e.g.*, text from title of web page, text from body of web page, *etc.*)

13

that corresponds to the search terms and does not show that a list of addresses or names that correspond to said search terms are presented.

In the Office Action, it states that "[s]ince the address box [in *Belfiore*] is always available for any subsequent attempts . . . the act of 'soliciting input of search term' is inherent, though implicit to Belfore's system." Page 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, if the address box is always available regardless of the situation, *Belfiore* does not seem to suggest "said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said RL is determined to be invalid," as recited in the claim. In addition, if the address box is always available and always had the label "address" next to it as shown in the figures, this seemingly fails to teach or suggest "soliciting input of search terms," as recited in the claim. Rather, it seemingly suggests input of an address is desired.

The Office Action further states that "it is noted that step 72 of Fig.4 is part of the auto-search. That is, if no valid results turn out after searching for the entered terms, the process would produce an error message. This is not related to the 'searching in response to invalid RL' feature." Page 5. Applicants submit, however, that if this is the case, then there does not appear to be any searching in response to an invalid RL being performed in *Belfiore*. For example, in step 92, of Fig. 7, *Belfiore* checks the syntax and format of an entered URL to determine if it is valid. If the format is not valid, then the autosearch process is implemented. In checking the format of the entered URL, the URL is checked to see if it contains a slash ("/") or a period ("."), for example. *See* col. 5, lines 25-36. *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited in the claim, however.

For at least these reasons, claim 24 is not anticipated by *Belfiore*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

j.   **Claims 25-28**

Because independent claim 24 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 25-28 (which depend from independent claim 24) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 25-28 contain all the elements and features of independent claim 24. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 25-28 should be withdrawn.

14

2. **Response To Rejections of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action, claims 4-6, 23, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Belfiore* in view of *Ling* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0059192). All of the claimed features of independent claims 1, 18, and 24 are not taught and suggested by *Belfiore*, as previously discussed. Further, the cited art of *Ling* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Belfiore* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claims 4-6, 23, and 29 (which depend from respective independent claims 1, 18, and 24). Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Belfiore* with *Ling* has not been made. Therefore, the rejections of claims 4-6, 23, and 29 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

15